

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 29, 2004. Claims 1-9, 14, 15, 17-19, 26-34, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45-47, and 50-59 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 9, 26, and 34 are in independent form. Claims 20-25 and 44 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and will not be discussed further. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 19, 26-29, 32-34, 46, 53, 55, 57, and 58 have been amended to define more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 5, 9, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 30, 34, 39, 40, 46, 47, and 50-59 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, on the ground that the claim recitations quoted in paragraph 2 of the Office Action, on pages 2 and 3, are not supported by the application as filed in such manner as to convey to those of ordinary skill that the inventor at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In particular, with respect to Claims 5 and 30, the Office Action alleges that the feature "associated with each item of added information received in response to the transmitted questions from the user, an item of information identifying the user who supply each item of the added information" is not described in the specification. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to page 14, lines 14 and 15, of the specification for support of this feature.

As to Claims 9 and 34, from which Claims 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 39, 40, 46, 47, and 50-59 depend, the Office Action alleges that the feature "estimation means for estimating value amounts of the presence of text, image and graphic zones in the document" is not described in the specification. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to page 17, lines 30-32, of the specification. This cited passage describes that a determination of the proportions of text, image,

and graphics in the document according to an analysis made on the document is performed. Further, with reference to Figures 9-11B, the specification describes an embodiment in which content indexes are determined in order to estimate the presence of text, image, and graphic zones in a document. (See, page 27, line 12, to page 32, line 10 (describing Figure 10), and more particularly page 28, lines 1-10, page 28, line 26, to page 29, line 5, page 29, lines 6-14, page 30, lines 8-17, and page 30, lines 21-30).

Applicants submit that the above-discussed features of Claims 5, 9, 30, and 34 are clearly described in the specification and that Claims 5, 9, 30, and 34 conform fully to the requirements of Section 112, first paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 14, 15, 19, 26, 27, 32, 34, 39, 40, 45-47, and 50-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,768,489 (*Adachi et al.*). Claims 3-6 and 28-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Adachi et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,839,829 (*Freedman*); Claims 8 and 33 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Adachi et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,511,156 (*Nagasaka*); Claims 17 and 42 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Adachi et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,298,173 (*Lopresti*); and Claims 18 and 43 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Adachi et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,184,999 (*Yoshida et al.*).

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 9, 26, and 34 in terms that more clearly define the present invention. Applicants submit that these amended independent

claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is a device for determining a printer pilot configuration of at least one printer for a printing process to be performed on a document in a file. The printer pilot configuration defines printing process parameters of the printer designated to implement the document printing process and is adapted for processing the complete document in the file. The device includes means for analyzing content of the document in the file to determine values of characteristics of a list of characteristics of the document. The determined values comprise at least a proportion of text, a proportion of image, and a proportion of graphic zones in the document. The device also includes configuration determination means for, without modifying the document, taking into account the determined values for automatically determining the printer pilot configuration.

Among the important features of Claim 1 are that the printer pilot configuration defines the printing process parameters of the printer designated to implement the document printing process, which is adapted for processing the complete document in the file, and that the configuration determination means, without modifying the document, takes into account the determined values for automatically determining the printer pilot configuration. That is, the printer pilot configuration defines the printing process parameters and is adapted for the printing process of the complete document. Thus, the printer pilot configuration determination is concerned with determining one printer pilot configuration for the whole document. That printer pilot configuration determination operates automatically and is based on the results of an analysis of the contents of the document, in terms of the presence of text, image, and graphic zones.

Adachi et al. relates to a print processing system which produces a printed output by processing the print information described in print languages. *Adachi et al.* describes a print processing system performing an analysis of a document in order to determine its contents. For example, if the document contains some text, graphics, or photo content, the print information pre-processing section 8 of the print processing system divides the document into several parts. (See, column 4, lines 58-64, and Figure 2). In accordance with the analysis of the document, a rasterize section determines the rasterizing processing time for each part and for the document. (See, column 10, Table 2). Based on this rasterizing time, an order of rasterizing is determined together with some algorithms of rasterization. (See, column 10, line 65, to column 11, line 52). Further, some printer characteristics, e.g., resolution, color, size of paper, are also taken into account. (See, column 5, lines 4-6).

However, nothing has been found in *Adachi et al.* that would teach or suggest that a printer pilot configuration defines the printing process parameters of the printer designated to implement the document printing process, which is adapted for processing the complete document in the file, and that the configuration determination means, without modifying the document, takes into account the determined values for automatically determining the printer pilot configuration, as recited in Claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants believe that Claim 1 is clearly patentable over *Adachi et al.*

Independent Claim 26 is a method claim corresponding to device Claim 1, and is believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1. Additionally, independent Claims 9 and 34 include similar features as those discussed

above in connection with Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent Claims 9 and 34 are patentable for reasons substantially similar to those discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and, therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ronald A. Cella", written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 2617B

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200